1 2 3 4	Daniel Bornstein (State Bar No. 181711) Laralei C. Paras (State Bar No. 203319) PARAS LAW GROUP 655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, California 94941 Telephone: (415) 380-9222 Facsimile: (415) 380-9223	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Clifford A. Chanler (State Bar No. 135534) CHANLER LAW GROUP 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840 Telephone: (203) 966-9911 Facsimile: (203) 801-5222  Attorneys for Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER  Douglas A. Marshall (State Bar No. 91227) KAY & MERKLE 100 The Embarcadero, Penthouse San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 357-1200	CORDON PARKALL COMMENSATION DESCRIPTION
13 14 15 16	Attorneys for Defendant THE MADDEN CORPORATION  SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
17	FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
18	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
19	RUSSELL BRIMER,	Case No. CGC-05-439568
20	Plaintiff,	[ <del>PROPISED] O</del> RDER PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT
21	VS.	
22	THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	Date: October 20, 2005
24	Defendants.	Time: 9:30 A.M. Dept: 302
25		Judge: Hon. Ronald Evans Quidachay
26		
27		
28		SENT JUDGMENT

1	Daniel D State Dep Nr. 101711		
2	Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711 Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319 PARAS LAW GROUP		
3	655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, CA 94941		
4	Telephone: (415) 380-9222		
5	Facsimile: (415) 380-9223		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Russell Brimer		
7	Douglas A. Marshall, State Bar No. 91227		
8	KAY & MERKLE 100 The Embarcadero, Penthouse		
9	San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 357-1200		
10	. ,		
11	Attorneys for Defendant The Madden Corporation		
12			
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALLEODNIA	
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
15	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
16	UNLIMITED CIVIL	JURISDICTION	
17			
18	RUSSELL BRIMER,	Case No. CGC-05-439568	
19	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
^ 20	v.	ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT	
20 21	THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,		
22	Defendants.		
23	1 INTRODUCTION		
24	1. INTRODUCTION		
25	1.1 Plaintiff and Settling Defendant.	This Consent Judgment is entered into by and	
26	between plaintiff Russell Brimer (hereafter "Brimer	" or "Plaintiff") and The Madden Corporation	
27	(hereafter "Defendant" or "Madden"), with Plainti	ff and Madden collectively referred to as the	
28	"Parties" and Brimer and Madden each being a "Parties"	rty."	
	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER RE CONSENT Case No. CGC05-439569 1-LA/823223.3		

- 1.2 Plaintiff. Brimer is an individual residing in Alameda County, California who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer and industrial products.
- 1.3 **Defendant.** Madden is a corporation based in Hawaii which manufactures, sells and/or distributes glassware and ceramic ware products. Madden operates three divisions, all of which are included in the definition of Madden for purposes of this Consent Judgment: Island Plantation; Island Heritage; and Island Bath & Body.
- 1.4 General Allegations. Plaintiff alleges that Madden has manufactured, distributed and/or sold in the State of California glass steins, shot glasses and other glassware and ceramic ware products with colored artwork, designs or markings on the exterior surface with materials that contain lead and/or cadmium in amounts which require a warning pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5 et seq., also known as Proposition 65. Lead and cadmium are chemicals known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm. Lead and/or cadmium shall be referred to herein as "Listed Chemicals."
- 1.5 **Product Descriptions.** The products that are covered by this Consent Judgment are defined as follows: shot glasses, glass steins, and other glassware and ceramic ware manufactured, sold and/or distributed by Madden with colored artwork, designs or markings on the exterior surface including, but not limited to, the products identified in Exhibit A attached hereto. Such products collectively are referred to herein as the "Products."
- 1.6 Notices of Violation. Beginning on January 3, 2005, Brimer served Madden and various public enforcement agencies with documents, entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" ("Notice") that provided Madden and such public enforcers with notice which alleged that Madden was in violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn California purchasers that certain products that it sold expose users in California to lead and/or cadmium.
- 1.7 Complaint. On March 16, 2005, Brimer, in the interest of the general public in California, filed a complaint (hereafter referred to as the "Complaint" or the "Action") in the Superior Court for the City and County of San Francisco against Madden and Does 1 through

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

150, alleging violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 based on the alleged exposures to one or more of the Listed Chemicals contained in Products sold and/or distributed by Madden.

- 1.8 No Admission. Madden denies the material factual and legal allegations contained in Plaintiff's Notice and Complaint and maintains that all products that it has sold and distributed in California including the Products have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Madden of any fact, finding, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Agreement constitute or be construed as an admission by Madden of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law or violation of law. This section, however, shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities and duties of Madden under this Consent Judgment.
- 1.9 Consent to Jurisdiction. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Madden as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment and to enforce the provisions thereof.
- Effective Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, "Effective Date" shall be 1.10 June 28, 2005.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

#### 2.1 WARNINGS AND REFORMULATION STANDARDS

Required Warnings. After the Effective Date, Madden shall not transmit to any entity to sell or offer for sale in California any Product containing one or more Listed Chemicals, unless warnings are given in accordance with section 2.2 below, or the Product is a Reformulated Product as defined by section 2.3 of this Agreement.

#### CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS 2,2

Product Labeling. A warning is affixed to the packaging, labeling, (a) hangtag or otherwise directly to or on a Product by Madden, its agent, the manufacturer, the importer, or the distributor of the Product that states:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This warning may not be used where Products are sold in close proximity to other like items which do not require a warning (e.g. Reformulated Products as defined in section 2.3)

WARNING: The materials used as colored decorations on the following decorated glassware or ceramic ware products sold in this store contain lead and/or cadmium, chemicals known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm:

[List Each Product By Brand Name and Product Description]

shall be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions prior to purchase and shall be placed or written in a manner such that the consumer understands to which *specific* Products the warnings apply so as to minimize the chances that an overwarning situation will arise. Any changes to the language or format of the warning required for Products by this subsection shall only be made following: (1) approval of Plaintiff; (2) approval from the California Attorney General's Office, provided that written notice of at least fifteen (15) days is given to Plaintiff for the opportunity to comment; or (3) Court approval.

(iii) If Madden intends to utilize Point of Sale warnings to comply with this Consent Judgment, it must provide notice as required by this Consent Judgment to each entity to whom Madden ships the Products for sale in California and obtain the written consent of such entity to provide the warning statements in the manner agreed to herein before shipping the Products. Such notice shall include any warning materials required by this Consent Judgment. If Madden has obtained the consent of the entity to whom Madden ships the Products for sale in California and Madden has complied with the terms of this agreement, Madden shall not be found to have violated this Consent Judgment.

# (c) Mail Order and Internet Sales

For Products that require a warning pursuant to this Consent Judgment and that are sold by Defendant by mail order or from the internet to a California address, a warning containing the language in subsection 2.2(a) shall be included, at Defendant's sole option, either: (a) in the mail order catalog (if any) or (b) on the website (if any). Any warnings given in the mail order

7 8 eit 9 co 10 pa 11 sp 12 pr 13 an 14 re: 15 sp 16 de

catalogs or on the website shall identify the *specific* Products to which the warnings apply, so as to minimize the chances that an "overwarning" situation will arise. If Defendant elects to provide warnings in the mail order catalog, then such warnings (at a location designated in subsection 2.2(c)(i)) shall be included in any new galley prints of such catalogs sent to the printer after this Consent Judgment is approved by the Court.

### (i) Mail Order Catalog

The appropriate warning message in subsection 2.2(a) shall be stated within the catalog, either (a) on the inside front cover of any catalog, provided that a reference to the inside front cover warning is also set forth on the page on which the Product is displayed, or (b) on the same page as any order form, provided that the Products to which the warnings apply are also specifically referenced on the order form, or (c) on the same page and in the same location as the price for the Product, in the same type size as the product description text, with the same language and specificity requirements found in subsection 2.2(a), provided that if one warning on a page references multiple products on that page, the Products to which the warning applies shall be specifically referenced on that page by an asterisk or other symbol next to the price or product description which refers to the warning. No warning shall be required under this subsection if Madden does not sell Products via catalogues to California addresses.

## (ii) Internet Web Sites

The warning text set forth in Section 2.2(a), or a link to a page containing such warning text, shall be displayed either (a) on the same page on which a Product is displayed, (b) on the same page as any order form for a Product, (c) on the same page as the price for any Product, (d) on one or more pages displayed to a purchaser over the Internet or via electronic mail during the checkout and order confirmation process for sale of a Product, or (e) in any manner such that is likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase of a Product. If a link is used, it shall state "Warning information for California residents," and shall be of a size equal to the size of other links on the page. No warning shall be required under this subsection if Madden does not sell Products via the Internet to California addresses.

#### 2.3. REFORMULATION STANDARDS

Products satisfying the conditions of Section 2.3(a), or 2.3(b), are referred to as "Reformulated Products." The warnings required pursuant to sections 2.1 and 2.2 above shall not be required for Reformulated Products, defined as follows:

- (a) If the materials on the exterior surface of the Product (1) do not extend into the top 20 millimeters of the ware (i.e., appear only below the exterior portion of the lip and rim area as defined by American Society of Testing and Materials Standard Test Method C927-99, hereinafter the "Lip and Rim Area") and (2) produce a test result no higher than 1.0 micrograms (ug) of lead and 4.0 micrograms of cadmium using a Ghost WipeTM test applied on all of the decorated portions of the surface of the Product performed as outlined in NIOSH method no. 9100, or
- (b) The materials on the exterior surface of the Product (1) do not extend into the top 20 millimeters of the ware and (2) contain six one-hundredths of one percent (0.06%) lead and twenty-four one hundredths of one percent (0.24%) cadmium by weight or less as measured (at Defendant's option), either before or after the material is fired onto (or otherwise affixed to) the Product, using a sample size of the materials in question measuring approximately 50-100 mg and a test method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of quantitation (as distinguished from detection) of less than 600 ppm pursuant to EPA Test Method 3050B.
- 2.4 **REFORMULATION COMMITMENT.** By entering into this Stipulation and Consent Judgment, Madden hereby commits that as a continuing matter of corporate policy, Madden intends to undertake good faith efforts, taking into consideration Madden's operational and product licensing restrictions, to ensure that as many Products sold in California as reasonably possible after the Effective Date shall qualify as Reformulated Products.

# 3. MONETARY PAYMENTS

3.1 Penalties Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). Pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b), Madden shall pay \$9,000 in civil penalties. The penalty payment shall be made payable to "Chanler Law Group in Trust For Russell Brimer," and shall be delivered to Plaintiff's counsel on or before June 30, 2005 at the following address:

CHANLER LAW GROUP Attn: Clifford A. Chanler 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840

- 3.2 In the event that Madden pays any penalty and the Consent Judgment is not thereafter approved and entered by the Court, Brimer shall return any penalty funds paid under this agreement within fifteen (15) days of receipt of a written request from Madden following notice of the issuance of the Court's decision.
- Judgment pursuant to section 6, all penalty monies received shall be apportioned by Plaintiff in accordance with Health & Safety Code § 25192, with 75% of these funds remitted to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the remaining 25% of these penalty monies retained by Plaintiff as provided by Health & Safety Code § 25249.12(d). Plaintiff shall bear all responsibility for apportioning and paying to the State of California the appropriate civil penalties paid in accordance with this section.

#### 4. REIMBURSEMENT OF FEES AND COSTS

4.1 The Parties acknowledge that Plaintiff and his counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby leaving this fee issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. Madden then expressed a desire to resolve the fee and cost issue shortly after the other settlement terms had been finalized. The Parties then attempted to (and did) reach an accord on the compensation due to Plaintiff and his counsel under the private attorney general doctrine codified at Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 for all work performed through the Effective Date of the Agreement. Under the private attorney general doctrine codified at Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, Madden shall reimburse Plaintiff and his counsel for fees and costs, incurred as a result

27

28

of investigating, bringing this matter to Madden's attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. Madden shall pay Plaintiff and his counsel \$29,000 for all attorneys' fees, expert and investigation fees, and litigation costs. The payment shall be made payable to the "Chanler Law Group" and shall be delivered to Plaintiff's counsel on or before June 30 2005, at the following address:

CHANLER LAW GROUP Attn: Clifford A. Chanler 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840

4.2 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, Madden shall have no further obligation with regard to reimbursement of Plaintiff's attorney's fees and costs with regard to the Products covered in this Action.

## 5. RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

5.1 Plaintiff's Release of Madden. In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to sections 3 and 4, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, and in the interest of the general public ("Releasors"), hereby (i) waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action, and (ii) releases all claims, including, without limitation, all actions, causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees and attorneys' fees) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Madden and each of its downstream distributors, wholesalers, licensors, licensees, auctioneers, retailers (including, but not limited to Impulse Cards and Gift), dealers, customers, owners, purchasers, users, parent companies, corporate affiliates, divisions, subsidiaries and their respective officers. directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees (collectively, "Madden Releasees") arising under Proposition 65, related to Madden's or Madden Releasees' alleged failure to warn about exposures to or identification of Listed Chemicals contained in the Products.

The Parties further agree and acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution of any violations of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted in the Complaints against Madden and Madden Releasees for its alleged failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to or identification of Listed Chemicals in the Products.

In addition, Releasors, (i) waive all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action, and (ii) release all Claims against the Madden Releasees arising under Proposition 65, related to each of the Madden Releasees' alleged failures to warn about exposures to or identification of Listed Chemicals contained in the Products and for all actions or statements made by Madden or its attorneys or representatives, in the course of responding to alleged violations of Proposition 65 by Madden. Provided however, Plaintiff shall remain free to institute any form of legal action to enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment.

It is specifically understood and agreed that the Parties intend that Madden's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves all issues and liability, now and in the future (so long as Madden complies with the terms of the Consent Judgment) concerning Madden and the Madden Releasees' compliance with the requirements of Proposition 65 as to the Listed Chemicals in the Products.

5.2 Madden's Release of Plaintiff. Madden waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff, or his attorneys or representatives, for all actions taken or statements made by Plaintiff and his attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 in this Action.

#### 6. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all Parties, in which event any monies that have been provided to Plaintiff or his counsel pursuant to Section 3 and/or Section 4 above, shall be refunded within fifteen (15) days of written notice by Madden.

#### 7. SALES DATA

Madden understands that the sales data provided to counsel for Brimer by Madden in the context of settlement negotiations was a material factor upon which Brimer has relied to determine the amount of payments made pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b) in this Consent Judgment. To the best of Madden's knowledge, the sales data provided is true and accurate.

#### 8. SEVERABILITY

If, subsequent to court approval of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected.

#### 9. ATTORNEYS' FEES

In the event that a dispute arises with respect to any provision(s) of this Consent Judgment, the prevailing party shall, except as otherwise provided herein, be entitled to recover reasonable and necessary costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred from the resolution of such dispute.

# 10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and apply within the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Products specifically, then Madden shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, those Products are so affected.

#### 11. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (1) first-class, registered, certified mail, return receipt requested or (ii) overnight courier on either Party by the other at the following addresses. (Either Party, from time to time, may, by written notice, specify a change of address to which all future notices and other communications shall be sent.)

1 To Madden: Dale Madden, President The Madden Corporation 2 94-411 Koaki Street Waipahu, HI 96797 3 Douglas A. Marshall, Esq. With a copy to: Kay & Merkle 4 100 The Embarcadero, Penthouse San Francisco, CA 94105 5 Clifford A. Chanler, Esq. To Plaintiff: 6 Chanler Law Group 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 7 New Canaan, CT 06840 8 12. NO ADMISSIONS 9 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by 10 Madden of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance 11 with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Madden of any fact, 12 finding, conclusion, issue of issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by 13 Madden. Madden reserves all of its rights and defenses with regard to any claim by any party 14 under Proposition 65 or otherwise. This section, however, shall not diminish or otherwise affect 15 Madden's obligations, responsibilities and duties under this Consent Judgment. 16 13. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE AND ELECTRONIC IMAGED SIGNATURES 17 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or other 18 electronic image copy, including .pdf file, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of 19 which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document. 20 COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f) 14. 21 Plaintiff agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health & 22 Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Pursuant to regulations promulgated under that section, Plaintiff shall 23 present this Consent Judgment to the California Attorney General's Office within five (5) days 24 after receiving all of the necessary signatures. A noticed motion to enter the Consent Judgment 25 will then be served on the Attorney General's Office at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date 26 a hearing is scheduled on such motion in the Superior Court for the City and County of 27 San Francisco unless the Court allows a shorter period of time.

## 15. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

The Parties shall mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this Agreement as a Consent Judgment and obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, the Parties agree to file a Joint Motion to Approve and Enter the Consent Judgment ("Joint Motion"), the first draft of which Madden's counsel shall prepare, within a reasonable period of time after the Effective Date (i.e., not to exceed forty-five (45) days unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties' counsel based on unanticipated circumstances). Plaintiff's counsel shall prepare a declaration in support of the Joint Motion which shall, inter alia, set forth support for the fees and costs to be reimbursed pursuant to Section 4. Madden shall have no additional responsibility to Plaintiff's counsel pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 or otherwise with regard to reimbursement of any fees and costs incurred with respect to the preparation and filing of the Joint Motion and its supporting declaration or with regard to Plaintiff's counsel appearing for a hearing or related proceedings thereon.

#### 16. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only by: (1) written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or (2) motion of any Party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court. The Attorney General shall be served with notice of any proposed modification to this Consent Judgment at least fifteen (15) days in advance of its consideration by the Court.

# AUTHORIZATION 17. 1 The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their 2 respective Parties, and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this 3 Consent Judgment : 4 AGREED TO: AGREED TO: 6 7 8 Date: June\_\_\_, 2005 Date: June / 1, 2005 9 10 11 Dale Madden, As President of 12 Plaintiff Russell Brimer Defendant THE MADDEN CORPORATION 13 APPROVED AS TO FORM: 14 APPROVED AS TO FORM: 15 Date: June \_\_\_, 2005 Date: June 2, 2005 16 17 KAY & MERKLE PARAS LAW GROUP 18 19 By: Douglas A. Marshall, Esq. Daniel Bornstein, Esq. 20 Attorneys for Defendant Attorneys for Plaintiff THE MADDEN CORPORATION RUSSELL BRIMER 21. 22 23 24 25 26 27

1	17. AUTHORIZATION	
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their	
3	respective Parties, and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this	
4	Consent Judgment.	
5		
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
7		
8		
9	Date: June, 2005	Date: June 2 2 2005
10		By: Dace P. Snardin
11	Ву:	
12	Plaintiff Russell Brimer	Dale Madden, As President of Defendant THE MADDEN CORPORATION
13		
14	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
15	Date: June, 2005	Date: June 25, 2005
16		
17	PARAS LAW GROUP	KAY & MERKLE
18		$\bigcirc$
19	Ву:	By:
20	Daniel Bornstein, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff	Douglas A. Marshall, Esq. Attorneys for Defendant
21	RUSSELL BRIMER	THE MADDEN CORPORATION
22		Ĺ
23		
24		
25		
26		•
27		
28		
	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER RE	14 Consent judgment
,	Case No. CGC05-439568 1-LA/823223.3	

## Exhibit A

Ceramic and glass tablewere products manufactured with colored artwork, designs or markings on the exterior surface including, but not limited to:

Canisters intended to hold food and/or beverages
Ceramic trivets and similar products
Espresso Mugs
Etched Stemware Glasses
Mini Mugs
Mugs (Ceramic & Porcelain)
Shot Glasses
Spoons/Ladles with decorations on non-food contact surfaces
Steins
Tumblers

1 2 3 4	Clifford A. Chanler (State Bar No. 135534) Stephen S. Sayad (State Bar No. 104866) CHANLER LAW GROUP 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840 Telephone: (203) 966-9911 Facsimile: (203) 801-5222	
5 6 7 8	Daniel Bornstein (State Bar No. 181711) Laralei S. Paras (State Bar No. 203319) PARAS LAW GROUP 655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, CA 94941 Telephone: (415) 380-9222 Facsimile: (415) 380-9223	OF THE CONTRACTOR DESCRIPTION OF THE
9 10 11 12 13 14	Attorneys for Plaintiff Russell Brimer  Douglas A. Marshall (State Bar No. 91227) KAY & MERKLE 100 The Embarcadero, Penthouse San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 357-1200  Attorneys for Defendant THE MADDEN CORPORATION	Donely Clerk
	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
15 16		
16 17		OUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
16	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND CO	OUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
16 17 18	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND CO	OUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  JURISDICTION  Case No. CGC-05-439568
16 17 18 19	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COULT UNLIMITED CIVIL RUSSELL BRIMER,	OUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  JURISDICTION  Case No. CGC-05-439568  FROM SUBSTITUTE OF SUBSTITUTE OF SUBSTITUTE OF SAN FRANCISCO
16 17 18 19 20	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1	Case No. CGC-05-439568    PROPERED   JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT
16 17 18 19 20 21	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	Case No. CGC-05-439568  [PROPERED] JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT Date: October 20, 2005
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1	Case No. CGC-05-439568    PROPOSED   JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT   Date: October 20, 2005   Time: 9:30 A.M.   Dept.: 302
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	Case No. CGC-05-439568    PROPOSED   JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT   Date: October 20, 2005   Time: 9:30 A.M.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	Case No. CGC-05-439568    PROPOSED   JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT   Date: October 20, 2005   Time: 9:30 A.M.   Dept.: 302
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNLIMITED CIVIL  RUSSELL BRIMER,  Plaintiff,  v.  THE MADDEN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	Case No. CGC-05-439568    PROPOSED   JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT   Date: October 20, 2005   Time: 9:30 A.M.   Dept.: 302

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	In the above-entitled action, Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER and Defendant THE		
2	MADDEN CORPORATION, having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be		
3	entered pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment		
4	("Consent Judgment") entered into by the parties, and after issuing an Order Approving		
5	Proposition 65 Settlement Agreement and Consent Judgment on October 20, 2005.		
6	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that pursuant to Code of		
7	Civil Procedure §664.5, judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the Order Approving		
8	Proposition 65 Settlement Agreement and Consent Judgment, between the parties.		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
10	Dated: October 20, 2005 RONALD E. QUIDACHAY		
11	Hon. Ronald E. Quidachay JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	- 1 -		
	[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT		